UNITED NATIONS

CCPR

International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights

Distr.
GENERAL

CCPR/C/SR.1231
13 May 1993

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

HUMAN RIGHTS COMMITTEE

Forty-seventh session

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 1231st MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Wednesday, 7 April 1993, at 3 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. ANDO

CONTENTS

Consideration of reports submitted by States parties under article 40 of the Covenant (continued)

Second periodic report of the Islamic Republic of Iran (continued)

This record is subject to correction.

Corrections should be submitted in one of the working languages. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent within one week of the date of this document to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Office of Conference Services, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza.

Any corrections to the records of the public meetings of the Committee at this session will be consolidated in a single corrigendum, to be issued shortly after the end of the session.

The meeting was called to order at 3.25 p.m.

CONSIDERATION OF REPORTS SUBMITTED BY STATES PARTIES UNDER ARTICLE 40 OF THE COVENANT (continued)

Second periodic report of the Islamic Republic of Iran (continued) (CCPR/C/28/Add.15)

1. At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Mehrpour and Mr. Nasseri (Islamic Republic of Iran) took places at the Committee table.

Right to a fair trial (article 14 of the Covenant) (section III of the list of issues)

2. The CHAIRMAN read out section III of the list of issues concerning the second periodic report of the Islamic Republic of Iran, namely: (a) the legislative provisions governing the tenure, dismissal and disciplining of members of the judiciary, and the manner in which the independence and impartiality of judges was ensured; (b) the jurisdiction and activities of the National General Inspectorate, the Administrative Justice Tribunal and the Revolutionary Courts, as well as the legal status of the revolutionary guards and the revolutionary prosecutors, and their relationship with ordinary courts; (c) the statement in paragraph 65 of the report that prosecution, trial, issuance and enforcement of a retribution verdict depended on the request of the next of kin; and (d) the organization and functioning of the Bar in the Islamic Republic of Iran.

3. Mr. MEHRPOUR (Islamic Republic of Iran), replying to Mr. Sadi's question concerning the practice of amputating a hand as a punishment for theft, said that such a punishment was provided for in the Koran, subject to a number of conditions. Extenuating circumstances were also taken into account; for example, if the theft was committed during a famine, the punishment would not be applied.

4. Referring to section III (a), he said that the independence of the judiciary was guaranteed by the Constitution. Judges were elected on the basis of their professional qualifications and high moral character. If a judge was alleged to have committed an error, his actions were reviewed by a special disciplinary office, which took appropriate administrative measures. Judges were not permitted to intervene in the selection of lawyers for the accused; such misconduct by a judge could lead to his ruling being overturned or to his dismissal by a higher court. At the same time, no other branch of Government had the power to prevent judicial decisions from being implemented. Article 164 of the Constitution stipulated that a judge could not be removed without proof that he had committed violations of the law; accordingly, emphasis was placed on preserving the independence and impartiality of the judiciary.

5. Referring to section III (b), he said that the functions of the National General Inspectorate had been defined after the Islamic Revolution. The Inspectorate monitored the administration of government and the implementation of the laws. Inspections were carried out on a case-by-case basis or on a thematic basis. In the first instance, the Inspectorate reviewed complaints brought by individuals and submitted reports to the parliamentary commission established under article 90 of the Constitution, or to the relevant ministry,

(Mr. Mehrpour, Islamic Republic of Iran)

for investigation. In the second instance, violations committed within the armed forces or State-owned corporations were reported to local prosecutors.

6. The Administrative Justice Tribunal was part of the judicial branch; it reviewed complaints brought by individuals against government agencies, and had the authority to reverse the decisions of such agencies if they were found to be unconstitutional.

7. The Revolutionary Courts had been established at the beginning of the Islamic Revolution. Their powers and functions were stipulated in article 150 of the Constitution. Like the armed forces, the Revolutionary Courts were under the supervision of the Ministry of Defence.

8. The revolutionary guards were members of the armed forces; they did not have prosecutorial functions, but played a role in enforcing discipline. The revolutionary guards had defended the interests of the Islamic Revolution during the war with Iraq. If a member of the revolutionary guards committed a crime which was related to the performance of military duties, that crime would be investigated and prosecuted by military courts; however, if the crime was in no way related to the performance of military duties, the individual would be tried in an ordinary court.

9. Referring to section III (d), he said that persons wishing to practice law must have attained at least a bachelor's degree and must apply for admission to the Bar. Upon completion of a training course, they sat for an examination and, if successful, received a licence to practice law. Currently, there were 2,661 lawyers in his country, of whom 185 were women; 267 persons, including 67 women, were attending law school.

10. The independence of the Bar was guaranteed by law; lawyers were free to accept any clients they wished. In the case of accusations that were liable to capital punishment or to life imprisonment, it was compulsory to appoint a lawyer; defendants could have lawyers assigned to them free of charge if they were unable to pay.

11. With regard to the fact that the head of the Iranian Bar Association had been appointed by the Government, he said that was a temporary appointment, pending the holding of new elections.

12. Complaints against lawyers and judges were reviewed by disciplinary courts, which handed down penalties where appropriate; those decisions were also subject to appeal.

13. With regard to the appeals procedure, all sentences could be appealed and, even in the case of murder convictions, sentences were not executed until all appeals had been exhausted. Furthermore, the Constitution provided for a waiting period between the rendering of a final decision and the execution of sentence. During that period, sentences could be appealed to the Supreme Court. The convicted person could also request a pardon; such requests were referred to a commission consisting of judicial and prison officials. Executions could not be carried out while requests for clemency were being considered.

Constitutional and legal framework within which the Covenant is implemented (articles 12 and 13 of the Covenant) (section IV of the list of issues)

14. THE CHAIRMAN read out section IV of the list of issues concerning the second periodic report of Iran, namely (a) the cases in which an individual could be banished from his place of residence, prevented from residing in the place of his choice, or compelled to reside in a given locality, and the compatibility of those provisions with article 12 of the Covenant; (b) the enjoyment, in the Islamic Republic of Iran, of the right of everyone to leave any country, including his own; (c) the conditions and procedure relating to the issuance of exit visas for foreigners whose duration of stay exceeded 90 days.

15. Mr. MEHRPOUR (Islamic Republic of Iran) noted that under the Islamic Punishment Law an individual who had committed certain crimes, depending on the type of crime and the nature of the defendant, could receive banishment in addition to the punishment determined by the Court. Article 90 of the Islamic Punishment Law stated that "(for) anyone convicted (of) a crime, the Court is authorized to deprive the convicted person of his social rights and also prohibit him from residing in any place or compel him to stay in a specific place. Such deprivation should be for a specific period of time and proportionate to the crime". That provision, in accordance with decisions of the Court, did not contradict article 12 of the Covenant.

16. In accordance with the rules of criminal procedure, individuals accused of criminal acts could be imprisoned or released, depending on the severity of the crime. In most cases, defendants were released on bail but might not be allowed to leave the jurisdiction concerned while awaiting trial.

17. Regarding the right of an individual to leave his country, no governmental authority without a judicial decree could prevent an individual from leaving the country. Certain restrictions did apply in the case of individuals who were being prosecuted and convicted criminals and in other limited legal circumstances.

18. Lastly, there were specific rules regarding the movement of foreigners in the country, the details of which were presented in paragraph 145 of the second periodic report. Foreigners were granted visas according them the right to stay in the country for 90 days; upon expiration of that visa, their stay would be considered illegal. If such foreigners could not renew their visa, and if they had no other legal status enabling them to remain in the country, they were obliged to leave.

19. Mrs. CHANET asked for more details regarding trials in the Revolutionary Court, which according to the note by the Secretary-General on the situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran, were almost always held in secret, inside prisons; proceedings were said to be summary, with no possibility even for defence counsel to attend (A/47/617, para. 57). She wondered under which conditions an individual could choose his or her defence counsel.

20. The right to appeal, in particular before the Revolutionary Courts, appeared not to be general, in that it existed in certain cases, but not in all. There had been instances where executions had been carried out before an appeal process could take place. She asked if the delegation could give more details regarding those proceedings and, in particular, regarding the right of appeal before the Revolutionary Courts.

(Mrs. Chanet)

21. Regarding the recruiting of judges, she sought clarification as to whether they were recruited solely from religious seminaries and whether their training had become broader. It appeared that judges could be dismissed for religious reasons or in the interest of society without the right to appeal. She would like to know what was meant by the "interest of society" and whether judges could be dismissed solely on the basis of religious considerations.

22. Mr. FODOR, referring to article 61 of the Constitution of the Islamic Republic of Iran, which stated that courts of justice were to be formed in accordance with the criteria of Islam, sought clarification as to whether there was a law that determined those criteria or if they were derived freely from religious principles. Regarding article 167 of the Constitution, which provided that in the absence of codified law judgements were to be delivered on the basis of authoritative Islamic sources and authentic fatawa (religious decrees), he questioned whether such religious decrees could be considered part of national law, since they could certainly not be considered part of international law in accordance with article 14 of the Covenant, and in what way a non-believer or believer of another religion was bound by the decrees of a specific religion.

23. Regarding public trials, in particular in the Revolutionary Courts, he asked whether statistics were available regarding the percentage of trials held in camera. Secondly, he inquired whether the judgements rendered by criminal courts were made public, even if the trials were not public.

24. According to article 168 of the Constitution, the definition of political offences was to be determined by law. It would be useful to know whether such a law had been adopted and, if so, whether it contained a precise list or merely criteria for determining political offences.

25. Paragraph 156 of the second periodic report referred to Penal and Legal Courts. He would like to know what the difference was between Legal Courts and Special Civil Courts. He would also welcome clarification as to the jurisdiction of the special clerics court referred to in paragraph 174 of the report and wondered if that court was also a criminal court. He inquired why it was necessary to have so many different types of courts, in particular so many special courts.

26. It would be interesting to learn whether the list of grounds on which review could be requested, which appeared in paragraph 155 of the second periodic report, was exhaustive or whether there were other grounds for appeal, in particular in the case of punishments considered too severe. Lastly, regarding trial guarantees, he requested clarification as to which limitations on procedural safeguards were applied in practice by the Revolutionary and Military Courts and whether defendants before those courts had unlimited access to lawyers, adequate time and facilities for the preparation of their defence and the possibility of calling witnesses on their behalf.

27. Mrs. HIGGINS said that she had specific questions regarding the right to a fair trial. Basing her first question on the reported execution in 1988 of 2,500 individuals who had been sentenced not to execution but to terms of imprisonment, she asked in what circumstances individuals who had been sentenced to one type of penalty could be subjected to another. Second, she sought clarification as to the role of repentance in release and specifically whether

(Mrs. Higgins)

it was correct that one not only had to serve the specified term, but also indicate repentance. Third, she wondered whether it was correct that those who had been sentenced as political prisoners were not released unconditionally, but always subject to recall. Fourth, she would like to know whether it was true that regardless of, or perhaps in conformity with, what the law provided, political prisoners often did not see a lawyer at any stage. Since the Revolutionary Courts did provide for appeal, she wondered what the permitted grounds for appeal were and expressed concern that if executions happened quickly, the right to appeal might become illusory. Where capital offences were concerned, documents were supposed to go on to the Supreme Court, but apparently executions often occurred within 10 days. The example of Mr. Bahman Samandari, a member of the Baha'i community in Teheran who had been arrested on 17 March 1992 and executed the following day, gave rise to disturbing questions about the fairness of trial and appeal.

28. Lastly, she would welcome clarification regarding reports that charges were often extremely vague and proceedings ended rapidly, because confession was often at the heart of the evidence in a trial. If confession under torture was not to be admitted, she wondered what checks were made to see how a confession had been obtained; it was said that trials often ended so rapidly that defendants were not clear whether they were still under investigation or involved in a trial.

29. Mr. EL-SHAFEI said that in view of the legal tradition in the Islamic Republic of Iran which recognized the authority of a number of qualified people to issue fatawa (religious decrees), the adoption of codified legislation dealing with both criminal and civil matters, and the existence of numerous categories of courts, he would like to know whether the administration of justice and the application of law were not rendered unduly complicated. Individuals had apparently been executed in cases involving loosely defined capital offences on the basis of a personal interpretation of the law and there were numerous instances of personal property being seized on the basis of fatawa. He thought that the institution of fatawa might impede the equitable application of law and would welcome clarification as to the remedies available in the case of a discrepancy between fatawa and the applicable law. He wondered whether that situation would give rise to uncertainties about the valid sources of law and what impact it had on the legal system as a whole.

30. Mrs. EVATT, referring to article 32 of the Constitution, which dealt with the rights of arrested persons to be informed of charges and to be brought to court within 24 hours, inquired how an individual whose rights had not been respected could lodge a complaint in that regard, and what procedure would be followed. She wondered whether in practice there had been any such complaints and subsequent prosecutions for violation of that article. Regarding the fact that the election of members of the Bar Council, scheduled to take place in October 1991, had been postponed, she asked if elections were planned for the near future and whether it was correct that the Government had passed laws enabling it to dismiss members of the Bar Association.

31. Regarding questions of equality before the law under article 3, paragraph 14, of the Constitution and the position of women in relation to the justice system, she sought clarification regarding reports that a woman was not considered a competent witness in connection with a serious criminal charge and

(Mrs. Evatt)

that a woman's evidence did not rank equally with that of a man under Islamic law. If that was the case, she wondered what consequences that situation had for offences where the woman herself was the victim of violence and rape and whether that meant it was impossible to secure a conviction in the case of such offences. She also requested additional information as to how that approach to evidence given by women affected prosecutions for the crime of adultery, the number of women and men who were prosecuted for such an offence and the number who were sentenced to death. At the previous session of the Committee the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran had stated that the faculty of judicial sciences was contemplating admitting women in 1993. She would like to know whether that had in fact yet occurred. Since women in Iran needed the permission of their husbands to travel abroad or take employment, she inquired whether men required similar permission from their spouses.

32. Lastly, it would be interesting to learn whether a study of the law had been undertaken to determine the extent to which Islamic scriptures contained texts that could be more fully emphasized because they supported the universal principles of the Covenant and whether the assistance of Islamic scholars in other countries, including human rights experts and women scholars of Islam, had been sought.

33. Mr. LALLAH said it was very gratifying to learn that there was an ongoing review and discussion with regard to possible inconsistencies between the Covenant and the laws applied in the Islamic Republic of Iran, particularly those relating to punishment. He associated himself with Mr. Fodor's questions regarding grounds for appeal and limits to the right to appeal and the comments of Mrs. Chanet, Mr. Fodor and Mrs. Higgins with respect to procedures governing fair trials.

34. Mr. Mehrpour's statement that his country had entered a new era of application of Islamic law was very important with regard to article 15 of the Covenant, because laws must be certain. In various other legal systems, such as the common law system, the law was certain because judges pronounced judgement on the basis of precedents. If the new Islamic law was being applied in accordance with a text based on the Koran, then offences must be accurately defined. Since there was a provision regarding non-retroactivity, he wondered when the new era of Islamic law had begun and whether any individuals were still awaiting trial for offences committed before the application of that law. Banishment was in complete violation of article 12 (3) of the Covenant. The right to freedom of movement could not be derogated from even in times of emergency under article 4 of the Covenant.

35. Mr. BRUNI CELLI said that according to Mr. Nasseri, efforts had been made to reduce capital punishment. Paragraphs 55 to 76 of the second periodic report referred to article 6 of the Covenant, on protection of the right to life, and paragraph 59 listed what were considered the most serious crimes. However, although Mr. Nasseri had recognized that the Revolutionary Courts were part of the Justice Department, they were not mentioned in those paragraphs; he wondered whether that meant that they had nothing to do with the imposition of the death penalty. As far as he could see, no links had been established between the most serious crimes liable to the death penalty and political offences. However, information received by the Committee indicated that political detainees had been summarily tried in secret and sentenced to death without the assistance of

(Mr. Bruni Celli)

lawyers or the presence of relatives and without any right to appeal. Of the 301 executions ordered by courts in the Islamic Republic of Iran in 1992, 64 could be attributed to political reasons; those executed included members of political parties. Another related cause for concern was extrajudicial executions, especially of political detainees. People had also been executed for their religious beliefs, a specific example being that of members of the Baha'i community. It had been reported that members of that community were not protected by the Constitution of the Islamic Republic of Iran, and that they had been threatened and executed and their property confiscated. They were allegedly discriminated against in schools and in the workplace. The Committee therefore wished to know whether the Baha'i community constituted a threat to the authorities and whether specific charges had been brought against its members.

36. Mr. WENNERGREN, referring to the right to a fair trial, observed that in his 1993 report on the human rights situation in the Islamic Republic of Iran (E/CN.4/1993/41), the Special Representative of the Commission on Human Rights had noted among other things that instead of open trials, trials in camera tended to be the rule, that criminal trials were held without guarantees of due process of law as established by the relevant international instruments, and that the lack of an independent bar association had adverse effects on the administration of justice. From the point of view of the Covenant those were serious allegations, which had been corroborated by other human rights organizations such as Amnesty International and the Lawyer's Committee for Human Rights, and he would be very interested in hearing Mr. Mehrpour's comments on them. He wondered how such a situation could exist, especially since the second periodic report indicated that all those guarantees should be provided for.

37. Turning to paragraph 179 of the report, concerning crimes by minors, he sought clarification as to whether decisions regarding the guilt of a child were taken by a court or some other entity, and whether the father or paternal relatives, who were required to pay compensation for a crime allegedly committed by a child, enjoyed presumption of innocence.

38. Mr. PRADO VALLEJO said that in some of the specific cases to which the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran had referred, there was a contradiction between Islamic legislation and the Covenant. Under article 2 of the Covenant, the first duty of a State party was to harmonize its internal legislation with the provisions of that instrument.

39. According to information in the possession of the Committee, there had been some summary trials and executions; prisoners had been executed for political and religious reasons; those executed for the latter reason included members of the Baha'i community. The situation of that community was of great concern to the Committee because its members were apparently still being discriminated against and lacked sufficient guarantees for the exercise of their religion. There were also reports of prisoners of conscience. He wondered whether the delegation would care to express its views on those matters.

40. Concerning paragraph 153 of the periodic report, he would like to know what was considered to be a political crime, who defined political crimes and what the difference was between a political crime and a common crime. With regard to paragraph 153 (a), he wondered whether the delegation could explain under what

(Mr. Prado Vallejo)

circumstances and for what purpose both parties to a trial could request that it not be held openly.

41. He was also seriously concerned about the cruel physical punishment of dismemberment meted out in certain cases. The delegation had said that the situation was under review; he hoped that that inhuman form of punishment would be abandoned. The Committee would also greatly appreciate it if more information could be provided about appeals, especially in cases where a crimewas punishable by death. Although the report did indicate that the legislation provided for appeals, it would seem that in practice appeals could not always be lodged. Additional information would likewise be welcome concerning the allegation that political detainees about to be released were forced to sign statements that they had repented and would not oppose the Government again.

42. Concerning paragraph 154 of the second periodic report, the Committee would like to know more about who appointed the members of the Revolutionary Courts and how the independence of those courts was guaranteed in order to ensure that their decisions would not be biased. With regard to paragraph 154 (d) the Committee would also appreciate more information as to who the "elements in previous regimes" were and how they had been dealt with, what crimes against the Iranian people were and how they could be characterized.

43. Mr. DIMITRIJEVIĆ welcomed the willingness of the Islamic Republic of Iran to reconsider fully all the factors and influences that affected the implementation of the Covenant. He was sure that ways would be found to harmonize the duties and obligations under the Covenant with the traditions of that country.

44. With regard to article 10 of the Covenant, Mr. Mehrpour's reply to the question concerning the private participation of the victim's family in prosecution for premeditated murder showed that the main motivation for criminal proceedings in such cases still seemed to be vengeance. If the same logic were applied to imprisonment, the result would be that people would be sent to prison only to suffer and not to be reformed. Under the Covenant, the main reason for imprisonment was social rehabilitation, which could be achieved in many ways, and he therefore wished to be assured that the Government was reconsidering the purpose of the treatment of prisoners.

45. If appeals were to be safeguarded, according to article 14 of the Covenant, some preconditions had to be met: the grounds upon which appeals could be based must be specified; clear instructions must be given as to where the appeal should be lodged; a time-limit should be set for consideration of appeals; and clear reasoning must be given for the decision on the appeal.

46. Concerning paragraph 35 of the report of the Special Representative, he would welcome clarification as to exactly what the grounds for sentencing Mr. Samandari had been. Since there was no clear indication as to what a capital offence was, the Committee could deduce from that example that a person could be sentenced to death for a cumulation of crimes. He did not see how an appeal could be lodged if the condemned person did not know the grounds upon which his sentence had been based. The problem was compounded by one of legal aid, for it seemed that in the Islamic Republic of Iran anybody could act as

(Mr. Dimitrijević)

counsel. The Committee would therefore appreciate it if the delegation could explain how a typical appeal could be lodged and what the procedure was in criminal cases, particularly capital cases.

47. MR. MAVROMMATIS said it would be helpful if the delegation could provide more succinct replies to members' questions. He had found it difficult to follow the earlier rather elaborate replies concerning drug-trafficking and the Salman Rushdie case. Nevertheless, he welcomed the new willingness on the part of the delegation to examine the country's laws and practices in the light of the provisions of the Covenant.

48. The impression gained from reading the second periodic report was that the country was plagued by obsolete and archaic laws and procedures. It needed to recognize, for example, that the imposition of punishment was no longer considered as a means of exacting retribution, or even as a deterrent. He was also surprised that the Revolutionary Courts should still be in existence 15 years after the success of the Revolution. Special courts of any kind should be established only as a temporary exceptional measure and with proper justification. Given the jurisdiction of the Revolutionary Courts, he felt that great caution needed to be exercised in their use. Like Mr. Prado Vallejo, he was concerned that such courts were empowered to investigate "certain elements in previous regimes" (CCPR/C/28/Add.15, para. 154 (d)). Surely that was a discriminatory measure. He failed to see why the cases concerned could not be dealt with by the ordinary courts.

49. He shared the concerns expressed by Mrs. Higgins and several other members concerning the situation of the Baha'is and hoped that the delegation would provide specific information on the individual cases raised. Indeed, there had been so many reports of human rights violations against Baha'is that the country was duty-bound to investigate the situation. It also had a duty to accept the Baha'is and to consider taking measures for their protection.

50. The restrictions on the appeals procedure were inconsistent with the provisions of the Covenant and the question needed to be given serious consideration. The Committee's general remark on article 14 of the Covenant might prove useful to the Government in its efforts to bring criminal law and procedure into line with the provisions of the Covenant. The independence of the judiciary could be secured through a number of measures, including security of tenure, immunity from criminal and civil process, and ensuring that the recruitment, appointment and transfer of judges were carried out in accordance with the law.

51. Mr. MEHRPOUR (Islamic Republic of Iran), replying to questions concerning the lack of access to lawyers, said that his country's laws and practices on the matter were very clear: in all courts, including military courts, all dependants had the right to a lawyer. Inevitably, there were situations in which violations of that right occurred, but they were dealt with in an appropriate manner and many efforts had been made to improve the situation in recent years.

52. On the question of the right of appeal, he said that all decisions of all courts were subject to appeal. The procedures for bringing an appeal were specified by law and there were no restrictions.

(Mr. Mehrpour, Islamic Republic of Iran)

53. Many Committee members had inquired about the proliferation of different kinds of courts in Iran. The Legal Courts dealt mainly with civil claims and cases might be referred to Court 1 or Court 2 depending on the seriousness of the offence. The Special Civil Courts dealt with private matters, such as divorce, marriage or alimony settlements. The Military Courts dealt only with crimes committed during the performance of military duties or violations of military laws. Their decisions were subject to appeal.

54. On the question of the training of judges, he observed that there were three law schools in Teheran which were open to both male and female students. All aspects of civil and criminal law and procedure as well as commercial law were studied over a period of four years. It was true that the emphasis was placed on Islamic law, but international law was also taught. Most of those who became judges possessed doctoral degrees in law. In addition, many women were currently practising law and many were employed in government departments. There were plans to begin admitting women to the judicial colleges in 1994. Students at those colleges were considered to be employees of the judicial system and had to undertake to serve as judges on completion of their studies.

55. Turning to the question of judgements issued on the basis of fatawa, he said that judges only issued such judgements when the case in question was not covered by codified law. If a legal issue needed to be resolved and no relevant legal provisions existed, the function of a judge was to interpret the law case by case and make use of precedents in order to reach a decision. Surely that procedure was common to all countries. In the event of conflict between a fatawa and the civil law, the civil law always took precedence.

56. There was currently no definition of political offences and no law had been passed to implement or explain article 168 of the Constitution. The question was currently under review.

57. Many members of the Committee had raised the question of secret trials. Under article 165 of the Constitution, all trials had to be held openly, unless the court determined that an open trial would be detrimental to the morals of public order. He felt sure that the situation was no different from that in other countries, where courts frequently sat in private session if exceptional circumstances so required. Article 165 also stipulated that, in private disputes, the parties could request that the trial should not be held openly. Such cases usually involved family disputes, where the parties did not want the issues heard in public. However, the right to a fair trial was in no way prejudiced.

58. While his delegation was aware that violations of proper procedures did inevitably occur, it felt that many of the reports concerning those cases were not properly documented and relied on unsubstantiated allegations. Unfortunately, he did not have the information available to give detailed replies to many of the individual cases raised.

59. The CHAIRMAN said that, because of the lack of time, the Committee would have to defer further consideration of the second periodic report of the Islamic Republic of Iran until its next session.

The meeting rose at 6.20 p.m.